

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 HOLLY SESOCK, et al.,

4 Plaintiffs

5 v.

6 RAVEN DUDLEY, et al.,

7 Defendants

8 AND ALL RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS  
9 AND THIRD-PARTY CLAIMS

Case No.: 2:20-cv-01466-APG-DJA

**Order Accepting Report and  
Recommendation**

[ECF No. 49]

10 On January 11, 2022, Magistrate Judge Daniel Albregts recommended that I strike the  
11 first amended answer, counterclaims, and third-party complaint (ECF No. 24) of defendants  
12 Raven Dudley and Chris Dudley and have default entered against them because they have failed  
13 to comply with three court orders. ECF No. 49. Raven Dudley and Chris Dudley did not object.  
14 Thus, I am not obligated to conduct a de novo review of the report and recommendation. 28  
15 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (requiring district courts to “make a de novo determination of those portions  
16 of the report or specified proposed findings to which objection is made”); *United States v.*  
17 *Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (“the district judge must review the  
18 magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations de novo *if objection is made*, but not  
19 otherwise” (emphasis in original)).

20 I THEREFORE ORDER that defendant Raven Dudley and Chris Dudley’s first amended  
21 answer, counterclaims, and third-party complaint (ECF No. 24) are stricken.

22 ////

23 ////

1 I FURTHER ORDER the clerk of court to enter default under Federal Rule of Civil  
2 Procedure 55(a) against defendants Raven Dudley and Chris Dudley with respect to the  
3 plaintiffs' complaint.

4 DATED this 31st day of January, 2022.

5 

6 \_\_\_\_\_  
7 ANDREW P. GORDON  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23